

Long-term Plan 2024–34



Respondent No. 315

Response ID 5676056

Date of contribution Apr 28 24 09:39:15 pm

Personal information

First name Anonymous

Last name Anonymous

I'm providing a submission (choose one): as an individual

Please let us know what ward you live in Waikanae

Do you want to speak to Council about your submission at our public hearings on 2 May? No

Are you happy for your name to be published with your feedback: I do not want my name published with my feedback

Submission

Proposal 1: Three waters funding
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Fund \$4.7 million shortfall with an additional 5% rates increase in Year 1.

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

It's better to do what you can now (rates fund the 3 waters shortfall) rather use debt to fund the shortfall. That is only adding more debt to pay back, and isn't very forward-thinking. KCDC can't get everything it needs to fund repairs and infrastructure from going further into debt. It's risky, and it means one day if KCDC needs to borrow for something really important, the funds may not be available, and the interest is horrendous. It's better to embrace the pain now.

Proposal 2: Proactively reduce Council's debt
Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 2: Apply average rates increases of 7% per year from 2025/26 to 2033/34

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 2?

This is the wisest and most responsible option. It will still hurt some people more than others, but it is

better than not doing what can be done now to reduce debt.

**Proposal 3: Transfer Council's housing for older people
Which option should we choose? (select one option)**

Option 1: Transfer our older persons' housing assets to a new Community Housing Provider

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

More say/sway, opportunity for growth, and being local, will know the needs of older people, and less financial on ratepayers' money. Sure, there's an increased outlay with this option, but it sounds like its needed. For these community housing provider schemes, I want KCDC to have more involvement so there is great transparency with how ratepayers' money is being used. I also want it to benefit local eligible older people.

New climate action rate

Which option should we choose? (select one option)

Option 1: Introduce a new targeted climate action rate based on a property's capital value rather than the current land-value based general rate

Would you like to expand on your answer for option 1?

It's about fairness for everyone and transparency for how ratepayers' money is used. I don't live anywhere near the sea, yet I'm contributing to the seawall in Raumati South. Seeing how the \$500k gets used every year will increase the openness of council funding.

If you have any views on these policies, please comment here:

Rates remission - I support people over 65 having the option to freeze their rates, subject to the criteria in the doc. Revenue & finance - somehow you need to find another revenue stream (unlikely), reduce services to shift funding elsewhere or increase user-pays charge - ie dog registrations.

Engagement - do you ever visit workplaces in lunchtimes to deliver a snapshot of the activity you're consulting on / proposed change? They are captive audiences, and could increase the level of understanding by the public about what you do. Yes, you'd need to have a thick skin, but if you want more engagement you need to do something that's more than the standard rinse and repeat activity plans.

Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about this LTP?

Don't let the vocal distractors hold you back from doing what's in the best interests of the community. Be bold & brave with your decisions.